

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DOCK McNEELY,
Petitioner, Civ. S-00-1358 DFL PAN P
v.

LOU BLANAS,
Respondent. NON-RELATED CASE ORDER

DOCK McNEELY,
Plaintiff, Civ. S-00-1508 WBS DAD
v.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.
Defendants.

DOCK McNEELY, Civ. S-00-2797 DFL PAN P
Plaintiff,
v.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.
Defendants.

1 DOCK McNEELY, Civ. S-01-2084 EJG GGH P

2 Plaintiff,

3 v.

4 ROY K. SIMMONS, et al.

5 Defendants.

6 /

7 DOCK McNEELY,

Civ. S-03-2172 DFL PAN

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 EDWARD BONNER, et al.

11 Defendants.

12 /

13 DOCK McNEELY,

Civ. S-04-0062 DFL PAN

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 LOU BLANAS, et al.

17 Defendants.

18 /

19 DOCK McNEELY,

Civ. S-04-1215 DFL PAN

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 EDWARD BONNER, et al.

23 Defendants.

24 /

25

26

1 DOCK McNEELY,

Civ. S-05-1401 MCE DAD

2 Plaintiff,

3 v.

4 SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.

5 Defendants.
_____ /

6 DOCK McNEELY,

Civ. S-05-2549 WBS DAD

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.


9 PLACER COUNTY, et al.

10 Defendants.
_____ /

12 A Notice of Related Cases was filed concerning the above
13 captioned cases on December 16, 2005. See Local Rule 83-123
14 (E.D. Cal. 2005). On review of the cases, the court finds that
15 the cases ought not be related or reassigned. This order is
16 issued for informational purposes only, and shall have no effect
17 on the status of the cases, including any previous Related (or
18 Non-Related) Case Order of this court. Therefore, they shall not
19 be considered related.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21
22 DATED: 1/31/2006

23
24 
25 _____
26 DAVID F. LEVI
United States District Judge

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26